

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 are pending and rejected.

The applicants' attorney cancels claim 2; amends claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13 and 15 – 20; and adds claim 21. Claims 4, 5, 12 have been amended, not to overcome the examiner's rejections, but to conform them to claim 1, as amended. Claims 17 – 20 have been amended, not to overcome the examiner's rejections, but to correct their dependencies. Furthermore, the amendments to claims 4, 5, 12 and 17 – 20 do not narrow the claims. The applicants' attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejections of claims 1 – 20 and asserts that claims 1 and 3 – 20, as amended, are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed below.

Rejection of Claims 1 – 6, 8, 9 and 13 – 19 in view of Takami *et.al.*

Enclosed is the inventors' Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 stating that they conceived of and reduced to practice the invention recited in claims 1, 13, 15 and 16 before the filing date of U.S. Patent 6,667,436 issued to Takami *et. al.* Therefore, the applicants' attorney requests that the examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 13, 15 and 16 over Takami *et. al.*

Claims 2 – 6, 8, 9, 14 and 17 – 19 are patentable over Takami *et. al.* by virtue of their dependencies from a respective one of the claims 1, 13, 15 and 16.

Rejection of Claims 1, 6 and 10 – 12 in view of Beavers

The applicants' attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 1 because U.S. Patent 5,896,268 issued to Beavers (Beavers) fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1 as amended. More specifically, Beavers fails to disclose a passage having an auxiliary opening.

The applicants' claim 1, as amended, recites a housing for an electronic system comprising a passage having a third opening.

For example, as shown in FIGS. 2 and 3, and discussed in paragraphs 6, 7, 14 and 16 of the specification, a computer system 30 includes a housing 34 which

has a passage 32 and an opening 53. The opening 53 holds an interface 41 that includes attachments, for example connectors 52 and 54. The passage 32 holds cables 38a and 38b as they extend from a camera 40 and PDA 44, respectively, to the connectors 52 and 54, respectively. The passage 32 includes a first opening 46 through which both cables 38a and 38b extend, a second opening 48 through which cable 38b extends, and a third opening 50 through which cable 38a extends.

In contrast, Beavers fails to disclose a passage having a third opening. Beavers discloses a repeater case 10 (FIG. 1) that includes a repeater case housing 14 (FIG. 2) in which modules 40 and circuit boards 36 are disposed, and a repeater base 12 (FIGS. 1 and 2) through which a stub cable 22 extends. The cable includes individual conductors 23 that are connected to a respective one of the circuit boards 36. The housing 14 includes an opening (shown in FIG. 2 but not labeled with a reference number) through which the cable 22 extends so that the individual conductors 23 can extend to their respective boards 36. The base 12 includes a first hole (shown in FIG. 2 but not labeled with a reference number) through which the cable 22 enters the repeater case 10, and a second hole (shown in FIG. 2 but not labeled with a reference number) disposed between the first hole and the opening in the housing 14, and through which the cable 22 extends. To help find the holes in FIG. 2, the first hole has a pressure relief valve 26 mounted to it, and the cable 22 turns 90 degrees immediately after extending through the second hole. The base 12 does not include more holes. Therefore, unlike the applicants' passage 32, the base 12 does not include a third opening.

Claims 6 and 10 – 12 are patentable by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1 as amended.

Rejection of Claims 13 and 14 in view of Beavers

Claim 13 is patentable over Beavers for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1 over Beavers.

Claim 14 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 13.

Rejection of Claim 15 in view of Beavers

Claim 15 is patentable over Beavers for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1 over Beavers.

Rejection of Claim 16 – 18 and 20 in view of Beavers

Claim 16 is patentable over Beavers for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1 over Beavers.

Claims 17, 18 and 20 are patentable by virtue of their dependencies from claim 16.

Conclusion


Applicants' attorney respectfully requests the examiner withdraw his rejection of claims 1 and 3 – 20 in view of applicants' amendments and remarks and issue an allowance for these claims and claim 21.

If the examiner believes that a phone interview would be helpful, he is respectfully requested to contact the Applicants' attorney, John Janeway, at (425) 455-5575.

DATED this 30th day of March, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



John M. Janeway
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,796
155-108th Avenue N.E., Ste. 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575

Enclosures: Return Receipt postcards (2)
Declaration Of Prior Invention